

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,358	04/24/2001	Robert A. Wiedeman	900.0004USU	6247

7590 06/28/2004

Harry F. Smith, Esq.  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
One Landmark Square,  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/841,358	WIEDEMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Farhood Moslehi	2154	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothblatt (6,105,060) in view of Blum et al. (6,182,141) (hereinafter Blum).

4. As per claim 1, Rothblatt teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system, comprising:

At least one user terminal (e.g. Abstract);

At least one satellite in earth orbit (e.g. Abstract; and at least one gateway bi-directional coupled to a data communications network (e.g. col. 3, lines 40-45); Rothblatt Further teaches a message from a one user terminal via said at least one satellite (e.g. col. 2, lines 43-55). Rothblatt does not specifically teach said at least one gateway comprising a controller for initiating a Domain Name Service (DNS) query in response to a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) received in a message. Blum teaches said at least one gateway comprising a controller for initiating a Domain Name Service (DNS) query in response to a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) received in a message. (e.g. col. 3, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide name resolution for the satellite link.

5. As per claim 9, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

6. As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

7. As per claim 2, Rothblatt teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system and but does not specifically teach further comprising a DNS server that is co-located with said gateway. Blum teaches a DNS server that is co-located with said gateway (e.g. Figure 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide name resolution for the satellite link.

8. As per claim 3, Rothblatt teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system, but does not teach wherein said controller receives an Internet Protocol (IP) address in response to said DNS query, and wherein said controller replaces said URL with said IP address and forwards said message to a destination server identified by said IP address (e.g. col. 3, lines 20-30). ). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide name resolution for the satellite link.

9. As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

10. As per claim 4, Rothblatt does not specifically teach a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said at least one satellite is in a non-geosynchronous orbit. Blum teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said at least one satellite is in a non-geosynchronous orbit (e.g. Abstract). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide data communications with a non-geosynchronous satellite system.

11. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

12. As per claim 5, Rothblatt does not specifically teach a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said at least one satellite comprises an on-board processor (OBP) that is responsive to said URL for selecting a gateway and for routing said message to said selected gateway. Blum teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said at least one satellite comprises an on-board processor (OBP) that is responsive to said URL for selecting a gateway and for routing said message to said selected gateway (e.g. col. 12, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide data communications with a non-geosynchronous satellite system.

13. As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

14. As per claim 6, Rothblatt does not specifically teach a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said satellite comprises at least one inter-satellite link (ISL) transceiver for routing said message through at least one further satellite. Blum teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said satellite comprises at least one inter-satellite link (ISL) transceiver for routing said message through at least one further satellite (e.g. col. 3, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide data communications with a non-geosynchronous satellite system.

15. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

17. As per claim 7, Rothblatt does not specifically teach a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said OBP is responsive to a portion of said URL that identifies a geographical region where a destination server identified by said URL is located, and operates to initiate a routing of said message to a gateway that serves said identified geographical region. Blum teaches a mobile satellite telecommunications system wherein said OBP is responsive to a portion of said URL that identifies a geographical region where a destination server identified by said URL is located, and operates to initiate a routing of said message to a gateway that serves said identified geographical region (e.g. col. 6, lines 37-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rothblatt with Blum. The motivation would have been to provide data communications with a non-geosynchronous satellite system.

18. As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

19. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

21. As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.


**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fm



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100